

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 28, 2005 are respectfully requested. Claims 51-59 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 24, 26-36, and 60-70 are currently pending this application.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks the Examiner for prompt, courteous, and thorough review of the application and assistance provided in two telephonic interviews on May 2, 2006, and May 3, 2006.

The Examiner granted a telephonic interview on May 2, 2006, to discuss the objections and rejections of the Office Action dated December 28, 2005. The Examiner clarified the objections and rejections, and the applicant agreed to make all changes suggested by the Examiner so as to correct clerical errors. Applicant also agreed to cancel claims 51-59 without prejudice in order to expedite issuance of a patent in this case.

The Examiner recommended another telephonic interview on May 3, 2006, to discuss concerns about claim 67. The Examiner agreed with a suggested amendment to add the phrase "between the client and the SRP" and the phrase "between the SRP and the web server" would be sufficient to alleviate concerns on the part of the Examiner that the phrase "intermediate storing of secure static content on a reverse proxy" is unclear. The applicant agreed to amend the claim for the sole purpose of expediting issuance of a patent in this case.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 61 because the Examiner believes the applicant meant to recite "the proxy server" at line 25. In the interview the Examiner granted on May 2, the clerical error to which the Examiner objected was identified and corrected.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 24, 26-36, 59, 60, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out and identifying the clerical errors made in the rejected claims. The applicants have amended all claims as suggested by the Examiner.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 51-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,584,567 (Bellwood et al.) in view of US Patent Publication No. US 2002/0015497 (Maruyama et al.) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,216,212 (Challenger et al.). The applicants have canceled claims 51-59 without prejudice for the sole purpose of expediting issuance of a patent in this case. The applicants respectfully reserve the right to reintroduce the claims in a continuation, if desired. Since claims 51-59 are canceled, an analysis of the cited prior art is deemed unnecessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The amendment was made to expedite the prosecution of this application. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the

amended claims and reserves the right to re-introduce them and claims of an equivalent scope in a continuation application.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel at the number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP



William F. Ahmann
Registration No. 52,548

Date: May 3, 2006

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918, Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 838-4300